

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
CINCINNATI DIVISION**

<b>HUNTER DOSTER, et. al.</b>	:	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>	:	Case No. 1:22-CV-84
	:	Hon. Matthew W. McFarland
<b>v.</b>	:	
<b>FRANK KENDALL, et. al.</b>	:	
:	:	
<i>Defendants.</i>	:	

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
EXCESS PAGES**

Plaintiffs, through Counsel, provide this Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Excess Pages (Doc. 137) requesting to expand their opposition to Plaintiffs' motion for attorney fees and costs/interim attorney fees and costs to 26 pages.

1. On May 1, 2024, Plaintiffs' filed their motion for attorney fees and costs/interim attorney fees and costs that was twenty pages long (Doc. 129), pursuant to Local Rule 7.2(3)'s requirement that memoranda in support of any motion not exceed twenty pages.
2. There is no reason to believe that Defendants cannot fully comply with Local Rule 7.2(3), in lodging whatever attacks Defendants may wish with respect to the fee application. Defendants raise arguments about this alleged need for an extension, yet their arguments actually demonstrate that it is possible for them to comply with page limitations if they choose to. For instance, Defendants argue that attachments in support with invoices are voluminous – yet Defendants have demonstrated elsewhere<sup>1</sup> that they are able to annotate those same documents to (effectively) evade the page limit requirement in all

---

<sup>1</sup> See Poffenbarger v. Kendall, 3:22-cv-00001 at Doc. 69-2, 69-3, 69-4.

events. Defendants argue that they allegedly need the extension to argue everything that they want to raise, yet they were able to summarize these issues in a single sentence in their motion for a extension.

3. Permitting the page extension here will merely cause the Plaintiffs to have to spend more pages in the Reply, driving up the attorney fees and costs further, which Defendants are already anticipated to complain about.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs request that the Court deny Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Excess Pages for their opposition to Plaintiffs; motion for attorney fees and costa/interim attorney fees and costs.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Christopher D. Wiest

Christopher Wiest (OH 0077931)  
Chris Wiest, Atty at Law, PLLC  
25 Town Center Blvd, Suite 104  
Crestview Hills, KY 41017  
(513) 257-1895 (c)  
chris@cwiestlaw.com

/s/Thomas Bruns

Thomas Bruns (OH 0051212)  
Bruns Connell Vollmar Armstrong LLC  
4555 Lake Forest Dr., Suite 330  
Cincinnati, OH 45242  
tbruns@bcvalaw.com

/s/Aaron Siri

SIRI & GLIMSTAD LLP  
Aaron Siri\*  
Elizabeth A. Brehm\*  
Wendy Cox\*  
745 Fifth Avenue, Suite 500  
New York, NY 10151  
(888) 747-4529 (v)  
(646) 417-5967 (f)  
aaron@sirillp.com  
ebrehm@sirillp.com  
wcox@sirillp.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

*\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing by electronic mail this 17 day of June 2024.

/s/Christopher Wiest  
Christopher Wiest